

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**
9 **CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**
10

11 SEAN WOFFORD,

12 Plaintiff,

13 v.

14 CHRISTOPHER BRACKS, et al.,

15 Defendants.
16 _____
17

) Case No. CV 15-1052-GW(SP)

) **ORDER ACCEPTING FINDINGS AND**
) **RECOMMENDATION OF UNITED**
) **STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE ON**
) **MOTION TO STRIKE ANSWERS**
)


18 Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636, the Court has reviewed: records on file; the
19 Motion to Strike the Answers of Defendants as Untimely and the related supporting
20 and opposing papers; the August 13, 2015 Order Denying Motion to Strike
21 Answers; and the objections and response thereto. The Court construes the Order
22 Denying Motion to Strike Answers as a report and recommendation, and the Court
23 has engaged in a de novo review of those portions of this recommended order to
24 which plaintiff has objected. The Court accepts the findings and recommendation
25 of the Magistrate Judge in the recommended Order Denying Motion to Strike
26 Answers.

27 //

28 //

1 IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that Motion to Strike the Answers of
2 Defendants as Untimely and to Cause the Clerk to Enter Defendants' Defaults Nunc
3 Pro Tunc (docket no. 25) is DENIED.

4
5
6 DATED: September 20, 2015



7 HONORABLE GEORGE H. WU
8 UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28